

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 remain for further consideration.

The rejections shall be taken up in the order presented in the Official Action.

3-4. Claims 1-4, 9-12 and 17 currently stand rejected for allegedly being anticipated by the subject matter disclosed in U.S. Patent 6,366,927 to Meek et al (hereinafter "Meek").

Claim 1 recites a vehicle navigation system that receives sensor data from a plurality of sensors, and provides a map image that is presented on a display. The navigation system includes "*a navigation map data memory that includes map data indicative of roadways stored in Cornu spiral form*". (emphasis added, cl. 1).

Meeks discloses a method and system for representation and use of shape information in geographic databases. It is alleged that Meeks discloses a navigation map data memory that includes map data indicative of roadways stored in Cornu spiral form (Official Action, pg. 2). In support of this contention the Official Action cites the Abstract, columns 1-2, lines 13-57; columns 5-6, lines 62-41 and columns 9-10, lines 10-20, all of Meeks. However, a careful reading of Meeks fails to even reveal even one instance of the term Cornu. Accordingly, Meeks fails to disclose the use of a Cornu spiral.

Meeks simply discloses a Bezier curve. However, it is known that a Bezier curve is not a Cornu spiral. A 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection requires that a single prior art reference disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. However, as set forth above, Meeks discloses a Bezier curve - not a Cornu spiral as set forth in the claimed invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Meeks is incapable of anticipating the claim 1.

Claims 9 and 17 also recite map data indicative of roadways stored in Cornu spiral form. Therefore, as set forth above with respect to claim 1, Meeks is also incapable of anticipating claims 9 and 17.

5-6. Claims 5, 7-8, 13 and 15-16 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 for allegedly being obvious in view of the combination of Meek and U.S. Patent 6,438,494 to Yamamoto (hereinafter "Yamamoto").

It is respectfully submitted that this rejection is now moot since claims 1, 9 and 17 are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

7. The indication that claims 6 and 14 recite allowable subject matter and would be allowed if amended to no longer depend from a rejected base claim is noted and appreciated. However, these claims are not being written into independent form at this time since the independent claims from which they depend are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-17 is respectfully requested.

If a telephone interview could assist in the prosecution of this application, please call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick J. O'Shea
Registration No. 35,305
Samuels, Gauthier & Stevens
225 Franklin Street, Suite 3300
Boston, Massachusetts 02110
Telephone: (617) 426-9180
Extension 121